



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/695,661	10/28/2003	Gerald Czygan	117163.00094	4060
21324	7590	04/23/2008	EXAMINER	
HAHN LOESER & PARKS, LLP One GOJO Plaza Suite 300 AKRON, OH 44311-1076				REIDEL, JESSICA L
3766		ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER
			NOTIFICATION DATE	
			DELIVERY MODE	
			04/23/2008	
			ELECTRONIC	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

patents@hahnlaw.com
akron-docket@hotmail.com

Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/695,661	CZYGAN, GERALD	

Examiner	Art Unit	
JESSICA REIDEL	3766	

All Participants:

Status of Application: _____

(1) JESSICA REIDEL.

(3) _____.

(2) David J. Muzilla.

(4) _____.

Date of Interview: 16 April 2008

Time: 2 PM

Type of Interview:

- Telephonic
 Video Conference
 Personal (Copy given to: Applicant Applicant's representative)

Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: Yes No

If Yes, provide a brief description: .

Part I.

Rejection(s) discussed:

Claims discussed:

1

Prior art documents discussed:

Prutchi et al. (U.S. 6,141,585) (herein Prutchi) and (EP 1,062,979)

Part II.

SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:

See Continuation Sheet

Part III.

- It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.
 It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.

(Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: The Examiner suggested Applicant amend Claim 1 such that it positively recites those elements of which the claimed invention allegedly "does not rely" (see page 14 of the April 2, 2008 Remarks). The Examiner also suggested Applicant Amend Claim 1 such that the language positively requires that the "means for monitoring stimulation outcome" measure the voltage or current during a time interval being between 0 milliseconds and 10 milliseconds after delivery of stimulation in order to overcome the rejections of Claims 1, 3, 4, 8, 40, 43, 46, 47 and 50-52 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Prutchi in view of Meier (see the Final Rejection of February 6, 2008). Applicant agreed to make the suggested amendments and faxed a proposed Amendment of Claim 1 to the Examiner for review and for use as a basis for a possible Examiner's Amendment of Claim 1 (see Applicant's Fax attached hereint). The Examiner notes that although the proposed Amendments agreed upon would overcome the rejections applied against the claims using Prutchi in view of Meier, upon conducting a subsequent search it appears that Molin (U.S. 2002/0123773) may be applicable for use in rejection of the proposed amended Claim 1. Molin expressly discloses of measuring a voltage drop over time at a tank capacitor during a time interval immediately following delivery of a stimulation pulse (i.e. during a time interval starting at 0 milliseconds and continuing until the end of the pulse) without use of active measurement pulses from an active current source or an active voltage source.